arXiv:1404.5856v2 [math.AG] 29 Jan 2015

Unipotent monodromy and arithmetic $\mathcal{D}$-modules

Daniel Caro

Abstract

In the framework of Berthelot's theory of arithmetic $\mathcal{D}$-modules, we introduce the notion of arithmetic $\mathcal{D}$-modules having potentially-unipotent monodromy. For example, from Kedlaya's semistable reduction theorem, overconvergent isocrystals with Frobenius structure have potentially unipotent monodromy. We construct some coefficients stable under Grothendieck's six operation, containing overconvergent isocrystals with Frobenius structure and whose object have potentially unipotent monodromy.

On the other hand, we introduce the notion of arithmetic $\mathcal{D}$-modules having quasi-unipotent monodromy. These objects are overholonomic, contain the isocrystals having potentially unipotent monodromy and are stable under Grothendieck's six operations and under base change.

Contents

1 Formalism of Grothendieck six operations for arithmetic $\mathcal{D}$-modules **2**
- 1.1 Data of coefficients . . . 2
- 1.2 Examples: overcoherence, overholonomicity after any base change . . . 4
- 1.3 Construction of stable coefficients under Grothendieck six operations and base changes . . . 5
- 1.4 Data of coefficients with potentially Frobenius structure over $\mathcal{V}$ . . . 6
- 1.5 Constructible t-structure for overholonomic complexes after any base changes . . . 7

2 Around unipotence **8**
- 2.1 Σ-unipotent monodromy . . . 8
- 2.2 Potentially Σ-unipotent monodromy . . . 10
- 2.3 Quasi-unipotence, coefficients satisfying semi-stable reduction property . . . 12

Let $\mathcal{V}$ be a complete discrete valued ring of mixed characteristic $(0,p)$, K its field of fractions, k its residue field which is supposed to be perfect. Let X be a smooth quasi-projective k-variety, $Z := X - Y$ be a simple normal crossing divisor of X, let $Z = \cup_{i=1}^{r} Z_i$ be the decomposition of Z into irreducible components and $\prod_{i=1}^{r} \Sigma_i$ be a subset of $(\mathbb{Z}_p/\mathbb{Z})^r$. Let E be an overconvergent isocrystal on $(Y, X/K)$. Atsushi Shiho defined (see the end of the definition [Shi10, 3.9]) the notion of overconvergent isocrystals having $\prod_{i=1}^{r} \Sigma_i$-unipotent monodromy. When $\Sigma_i = \{0\}$, we retrieve Kedlaya's unipotent monodromy (see [Ked07]). Without non Liouvilleness conditions, these isocrystals have no finite cohomology and in particular they are not (over)holonomic. If Σ is a subgroup of $\mathbb{Z}_p/\mathbb{Z}$ with none p-adically Liouville numbers, then it follows from [CT12, 2.3.13] that an overconvergent isocrystals with Σ^r-unipotent monodromy are overholonomic. We recall that with Frobenius structures, we already know the stability under Grothendieck's six operations of the overholonomicity (see [CT12]) but, without Frobenius structures, the stability under tensor products is still an open question. In this paper, in the framework of Berthelot's arithmetic $\mathcal{D}$-modules, we introduce the notion of arithmetic $\mathcal{D}$-modules having potentially Σ-unipotent monodromy (see 2.2.4). For example overconvergent isocrystals having potentially means that they get Σ^r-unipotent monodromy after some generically etale alteration. By descent from this alteration, we check that they are overholonomic. Moreover, a reformulation of Kedlaya's semistable reduction theorem (see [Ked07, Ked08, Ked09, Ked11]) is that overconvergent isocrystals with some Frobenius structure have potentially unipotent monodromy. We also introduce the notion of arithmetic $\mathcal{D}$-modules having quasi-Σ-unipotent monodromy (see 2.3.1). These coefficients are overholonomic, contain isocrystals having potentially Σ^r-unipotent monodromy and are stable under Grothendieck's six operations and base change. Finally, we construct some coefficients stable

under Grothendieck's six operation and base change, containing overconvergent isocrystals with Frobenius structure and whose objects have potentially unipotent monodromy.

Convention

Let Σ be a subgroup of $\mathbb{Z}_p/\mathbb{Z}$ with none p-adically Liouville numbers. We choose $\tau\colon \mathbb{Z}_p/\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}_p$ a section of the canonical extension $\mathbb{Z}_p \to \mathbb{Z}_p/\mathbb{Z}$ such that $\tau(0)=0$. Let $\mathcal{V}$ be a complete discrete valued ring of mixed characteristic $(0,p)$, K its field of fractions, k its residue field which is supposed to be perfect. A formal scheme over $\mathcal{V}$ means a formal scheme for the p-adic topology. The special fiber of a formal scheme over $\mathcal{V}$ will be denoted by the corresponding capital roman letter. If we do not specify, a realizable variety means a realizable variety over $\mathcal{V}$ i.e. a k-variety Y such that there exists an immersion of the form $Y \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}$ where $\mathcal{P}$ is a proper smooth formal scheme over $\mathcal{V}$. A quasi-proper smooth formal scheme over $\mathcal{V}$ is a smooth formal $\mathcal{V}$-scheme such that there exists an open immersion of the form $\mathcal{P} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Q}$, where $\mathcal{Q}$ is a proper smooth formal $\mathcal{V}$-scheme. A frame (resp. proper frame) $(Y,X,\mathcal{P})$ or $(Y,\mathcal{P})$ over $\mathcal{V}$ means that $\mathcal{P}$ is a quasi-proper (resp. proper) smooth formal scheme over $\mathcal{V}$, X is a closed subscheme of the special fiber P of $\mathcal{P}$ and Y is an open of X. If there is no ambiguity, we simply say frame (resp. proper frame). A couple (resp. proper couple) (Y,X) over $\mathcal{V}$ means the first data of a frame (resp. proper frame) over $\mathcal{V}$ of the form $(Y,X,\mathcal{P})$.

1 Formalism of Grothendieck six operations for arithmetic $\mathcal{D}$-modules

1.1 Data of coefficients

1.1.1. We recall some basic isomorphisms we need to keep in mind later.

1. Let $f\colon \mathcal{Y} \to \mathcal{X}$ be a morphism of smooth formal $\mathcal{V}$-schemes. Following [Car04, 2.1.4], for any $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)} \in \underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{qc}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathcal{X}})$, $\mathcal{F}^{(\bullet)} \in \underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{qc}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathcal{Y}})$ we have the isomorphism
$$f_+\left(\mathcal{F}^{(\bullet)} \overset{\mathbb{L}}{\otimes}{}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}} f^!(\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)})\right) \xrightarrow{\sim} f_+(\mathcal{F}^{(\bullet)}) \overset{\mathbb{L}}{\otimes}{}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}}} \mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}[d_{Y/X}]. \tag{1.1.1.1}$$
2. Let $f\colon \mathcal{Y} \to \mathcal{X}$, $g\colon \mathcal{X}' \to \mathcal{X}$ be two morphisms of smooth formal $\mathcal{V}$-schemes such that $\mathcal{Y}' := \mathcal{Y} \times_{\mathcal{X}} \mathcal{X}'$ is a smooth formal $\mathcal{V}$-scheme. Let $f'\colon \mathcal{Y}' \to \mathcal{X}'$ and $g'\colon \mathcal{Y}' \to \mathcal{Y}$ be the canonical morphisms. From [Abe14, 5.7], for any $\mathcal{E}'^{(\bullet)} \in \underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{qc}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathcal{X}'})$, we have the base change isomorphism
$$f^! g_+(\mathcal{E}'^{(\bullet)}) \xrightarrow{\sim} g'_+ f'^!(\mathcal{E}'^{(\bullet)}). \tag{1.1.1.2}$$

1.1.2 (Base change and its commutation with Grothendieck six operations)**.** We denote by $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V})$ the category whose objects are morphisms of complete discrete valued ring of mixed characteristic $(0,p)$ with perfect residue field of the form $\mathcal{V} \to \mathcal{W}$ and whose morphisms from $\mathcal{V} \to \mathcal{W}$ to $\mathcal{V} \to \mathcal{W}'$ are morphisms $\mathcal{W} \to \mathcal{W}'$ of $\mathcal{V}$-algebras.

Let $\alpha\colon \mathcal{W} \to \mathcal{W}'$ be a morphism of $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V})$, let $\mathcal{X}$ be a smooth formal scheme over $\mathcal{W}$, $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)} \in \underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{qc}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathcal{X}})$ $\mathcal{X}' := \mathcal{X} \times_{\mathrm{Spf}(\mathcal{W})} \mathrm{Spf}\,\mathcal{W}'$ and $\pi_\alpha\colon \mathcal{X}' \to \mathcal{X}$ the projection. The base change of $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}$ by α is the object $\pi_\alpha^!(\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}) = \pi_\alpha^{!(\bullet)}(\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)})$ of $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{qc}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathcal{X}'})$ (see [Ber02, 2.2.2]). Similarly than [Ber02, 2.2.2], it will simply be denoted by $\mathcal{W}' \overset{\mathbb{L}}{\otimes}{}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{W}} \mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}$.

From [Ber02, 2.4.2], push forwards commute with base change. The commutation of base change with extraordinary pull-backs, duals functors (for coherent complexes), tensor products is straightforward. Hence, base change commutes with Grothendieck six operations.

1.1.3. Let $\mathcal{W}$ be an object of $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V})$, $\mathcal{X}$ be a smooth formal scheme over $\mathcal{W}$. Berthelot checked the equivalence of categories (see [Ber02, 4.2.4]):
$$\varinjlim\colon \underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{coh}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathcal{X}}) \cong D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{X}\mathbb{Q}}). \tag{1.1.3.1}$$
We recall that, from the proposition [Car12b, 5.4.3], we have such an equivalence by replacing the notion of coherence by that of overcoherence (see the definition of overcoherence for inductive systems in [Car12b]). We denote by

$D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{ovhol}}(\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}_{\mathfrak{X}\mathbb{Q}})$ (resp. $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{h}}(\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}_{\mathfrak{X}\mathbb{Q}})$) the category of overholonomic complexes of $\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}_{\mathfrak{X}\mathbb{Q}}$-modules as defined in [Car09a] (resp. overholonomic complexes of $\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}_{\mathfrak{X}\mathbb{Q}}$-modules after any base change as defined in [Car11a]). For a new way of defining these categories, we can look at the last example in 1.2.2.

Definition 1.1.4. A *data of coefficients* $\mathfrak{C}$ *over* $\mathcal{V}$ will be the data for any object $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V})$, for any quasi-proper smooth formal scheme $\mathfrak{X}$ over $\mathcal{W}$, of a full subcategory of $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{coh}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathfrak{X}})$, which will be denoted by $\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X})$. If there is no ambiguity with $\mathcal{V}$, we simply say a *data of coefficients.*

Definition 1.1.5. In order to be precise, let us fix some terminology. Let $\mathfrak{C}$ and $\mathfrak{D}$ be two coefficient data.

1. We will say that the coefficients of $\mathfrak{C}$ are (or that the data of coefficients $\mathfrak{C}$ is) stable under push-forward if for any *proper* morphism $g\colon \mathfrak{X}' \to \mathfrak{X}$ of quasi-proper smooth formal schemes over $\mathcal{W}$, for any objet $\mathcal{E}'^{(\bullet)}$ of $\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}')$, we have $g_+(\mathcal{E}'^{(\bullet)})$ is an object of $\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X})$.

2. We will say that the coefficients of $\mathfrak{C}$ are stable under extraordinary pull-backs if for any object $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V})$, for any morphism $f\colon \mathcal{Y} \to \mathfrak{X}$ of quasi-proper smooth formal schemes over $\mathcal{W}$, for any objet $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}$ of $\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X})$, we have $f^!(\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}) \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathcal{Y})$.

3. We will say that the coefficients of $\mathfrak{C}$ are stable under base change if for any morphism $\mathcal{W} \to \mathcal{W}'$ of $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V})$, for any quasi-proper smooth formal scheme $\mathfrak{X}$ over $\mathcal{W}$, for any objet $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}$ of $\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X})$, we have $\mathcal{W}'\overset{\mathbb{L}}{\otimes}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{W}}\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)} \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X} \times_{\mathrm{Spf}\,\mathcal{W}} \mathrm{Spf}\,\mathcal{W}')$.

4. We will say that the coefficients of $\mathfrak{C}$ are stable under tensor products (resp. duals) if for any object $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V})$, for any quasi-proper smooth formal scheme $\mathfrak{X}$ over $\mathcal{W}$, for any objects $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}$ and $\mathcal{F}^{(\bullet)}$ of $\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X})$ we have $\mathcal{F}^{(\bullet)}\overset{\mathbb{L}}{\otimes}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}}\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)} \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X})$ (resp. $\mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}) \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X})$) .

5. We will say that the coefficients of $\mathfrak{C}$ are stable under local cohomological functor, if for any object $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V})$, for any quasi-proper smooth formal scheme $\mathfrak{X}$ over $\mathcal{W}$, for any object $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}$ of $\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X})$, for any subvariety Y of the special fiber of $\mathfrak{X}$, we have $\mathbb{R}\underline{\Gamma}^{\dagger}_{Y}\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)} \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X})$ (see the notation of [Car07, 3.2.1]).

6. We will say that the coefficients of $\mathfrak{C}$ are stable by devissages if for any object $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V})$, for any quasi-proper smooth formal scheme $\mathfrak{X}$ over $\mathcal{W}$, for any exact triangle $\mathcal{E}_1^{(\bullet)} \to \mathcal{E}_2^{(\bullet)} \to \mathcal{E}_3^{(\bullet)} \to \mathcal{E}_1^{(\bullet)}[1]$ of $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{coh}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathfrak{X}})$, if two objects are in $\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X})$, then so is the third one.

7. We will say that the coefficients of $\mathfrak{C}$ are stable under direct factor if, for any object $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V})$, for any quasi-proper smooth formal scheme $\mathfrak{X}$ over $\mathcal{W}$ we have the following property: any direct factor in $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{coh}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathfrak{X}})$ of an object of $\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X})$ is an object of $\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X})$.

8. We say that $\mathfrak{C}$ contains $\mathfrak{D}$ if for any object $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V})$, for any quasi-proper smooth formal scheme $\mathfrak{X}$ over $\mathcal{W}$ the category $\mathfrak{D}(\mathfrak{X})$ is a subcategory of $\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X})$.

9. We say that the data of coefficients $\mathfrak{C}$ is local if for any object $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V})$, for any quasi-proper smooth formal scheme $\mathfrak{X}$ over $\mathcal{W}$, for any open covering $(\mathfrak{X}_i)_{i\in I}$ of $\mathfrak{X}$, for any object $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}$ of $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{coh}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathfrak{X}})$, we have $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)} \in \mathrm{Ob}\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X})$ if and only if $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}|\mathfrak{X}_i \in \mathrm{Ob}\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}_i)$ for any $i \in I$.

Remark 1.1.6. We can also define a notion of data of coefficients by replacing in 1.1.4 the categories of the form $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{coh}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathfrak{X}})$ by that of the form $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}_{\mathfrak{X}\mathbb{Q}})$. We can also get analogous definition of stability properties since the cohomological operations commute with the equivalences of categories of the form 1.1.3.1.

1.1.7 (Duality)**.** Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a data of coefficients. We define its dual data of coefficients $\mathfrak{C}^{\vee}$ as follows: for any object $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V})$, for any quasi-proper smooth formal scheme $\mathfrak{X}$ over $\mathcal{W}$, the category $\mathfrak{C}^{\vee}(\mathfrak{X})$ is the subcategory of $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{coh}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathfrak{X}})$ of objects $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}$ such that $\mathbb{D}_{\mathfrak{X}}(\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}) \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X})$. From the relative duality isomorphism (see [Vir04]), we remark that if the coefficients of $\mathfrak{C}$ are stable under push-forwards, then so are that of $\mathfrak{C}^{\vee}$.

1.2 Examples: overcoherence, overholonomicity after any base change

Definition 1.2.1. Let $\mathfrak{C}$ and $\mathfrak{D}$ be two data of coefficients.

1. We denote by $S_0(\mathfrak{D},\mathfrak{C})$ the data of coefficients defined as follows: for any object $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V})$, for any quasi-proper smooth formal scheme $\mathfrak{X}$ over $\mathcal{W}$, the category $S_0(\mathfrak{D},\mathfrak{C})(\mathfrak{X})$ is the full subcategory of $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{coh}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathfrak{X}})$ of objects $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}$ satisfying the following properties :

   ($\star$) for any morphism $f\colon \mathcal{Y}\to\mathfrak{X}$ of quasi-proper smooth formal $\mathcal{W}$-schemes, for any $\mathcal{F}^{(\bullet)}\in\mathfrak{D}(\mathcal{Y})$, we have $\mathcal{F}^{(\bullet)}\overset{\mathbb{L}}{\otimes}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}}} f^{!}(\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)})\in\mathfrak{C}(\mathcal{Y})$.

2. We denote by $S(\mathfrak{D},\mathfrak{C})$ the data of coefficients defined as follows: for any object $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V})$, for any quasi-proper smooth formal scheme $\mathfrak{X}$ over $\mathcal{W}$, the category $S(\mathfrak{D},\mathfrak{C})(\mathfrak{X})$ is the full subcategory of $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{coh}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathfrak{X}})$ of objects $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}$ satisfying the following property:

   ($\star\star$) for any morphism $\mathcal{W}\to\mathcal{W}'$ of $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V})$, we have $\mathcal{W}'\overset{\mathbb{L}}{\otimes}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{W}}\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}\in S_0(\mathfrak{D},\mathfrak{C})(\mathfrak{X}\times_{\mathrm{Spf}\,\mathcal{W}}\mathrm{Spf}\,\mathcal{W}')$.

Examples 1.2.2. 1. Let $\mathfrak{D}_{\mathrm{cst}}$ be the data of coefficients defined as follows: for any object $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V})$, for any quasi-proper smooth formal scheme $\mathfrak{X}$ over $\mathcal{W}$, the category $\mathfrak{D}(\mathfrak{X})$ is the full subcategory of $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{coh}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathfrak{X}})$ whose objects are of the form $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathfrak{X}}(T)$, where T is any divisor of the special fiber of $\mathfrak{X}$ (this is the object corresponding via the equivalence of categories 1.1.3.1 to the sheaf of sections with overconvergent singularity along T denoted by $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}({}^{\dagger}T)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ in [Ber96, Ber02]).

2. Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a data of coefficients which is local and satisfies the following property: for any object $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V})$, for any closed immersion $u_+\colon\mathfrak{X}'\to\mathfrak{X}$ of quasi-proper smooth formal schemes over $\mathcal{W}$, for any object $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}$ of $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{qc}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathfrak{X}'})$, if $u_+(\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)})\in\mathrm{Ob}\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X})$ then $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}\in\mathrm{Ob}\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X}')$. In that case, in the definition of $S_0(\mathfrak{D}_{\mathrm{cst}},\mathfrak{C})$, we can restrict the property ($\star$) to *smooth* morphisms $f\colon\mathcal{Y}\to\mathfrak{X}$ of quasi-proper smooth formal $\mathcal{W}$-schemes (this is checked as in [Car04, 3.1.7] using Kashiwara's theorem of the form [Car12b, 5.3.7]).

3. With the above remark, we get by definition the equality $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{surcoh}}=S_0(\mathfrak{D}_{\mathrm{cst}},\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{coh}})$ (this notion of overcoherence is defined in [Car12b, 5.4]). Moreover, $S(\mathfrak{D}_{\mathrm{cst}},\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{coh}})$ corresponds to the notion of overcoherence after any base change as defined in [Car11a].

4. We put $\mathfrak{H}_0:=S(\mathfrak{D}_{\mathrm{cst}},\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{coh}})$ and by induction on $i\in\mathbb{N}$, we put $\mathfrak{H}_{i+1}:=\mathfrak{H}_i\cap S(\mathfrak{D}_{\mathrm{cst}},\mathfrak{H}_i^{\vee})$. The coefficients of $\mathfrak{H}_i$ are called i-overholonomic after any base change. We get the data of coefficients $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{h}}=\cap_{i\in\mathbb{N}}\mathfrak{H}_i$ whose objects are called overholonomic after any base change.

5. Replacing S by S_0 in the definition of $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{h}}$, we get a data of coefficients that we will denote by $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{ovhol}}$. We remark that $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{ovhol}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathfrak{X}})$ is the full subcategory of $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{coh}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathfrak{X}})$ of objects $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}$ such that $\varinjlim\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}$ is an object of $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{ovhol}}(\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}_{\mathfrak{X}\mathbb{Q}})$ (this latter category is defined in [Car09a, 3]).

Remark 1.2.3. 1. Using [Car12b, 5.4.3], we check that for any object $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V})$, for any quasi-proper smooth formal $\mathcal{W}$-scheme $\mathfrak{X}$, the functor $\varinjlim$ of 1.1.3.1 induces an equivalence between $\mathfrak{H}_i$ and the full subcategory of $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}_{\mathfrak{X}\mathbb{Q}})$ consisting of i-overholonomic complexes (see the terminology of [Car09a, 3.1]) after any base change.

2. By construction, we remark that $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{ovhol}}$ is the biggest data of coefficients which contains $\mathfrak{D}_{\mathrm{cst}}$, is stable by direct push-forwards, extraordinary pull-backs, dual functors and the operation $S_0(\mathfrak{D}_{\mathrm{cst}},-)$.

3. Moreover, $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{h}}$ is the biggest data of coefficients which contains $\mathfrak{D}_{\mathrm{cst}}$, is stable by direct push-forwards, extraordinary pull-backs, base changes, dual functors and the operation $S(\mathfrak{D}_{\mathrm{cst}},-)$.

1.3 Construction of stable coefficients under Grothendieck six operations and base changes

1.3.1 (Formalism of Grothendieck six operations)**.** Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a data of coefficients which is stable under local cohomological functors, push-forwards, extraordinary pull-backs, duals. We can define a formalism of Grothendieck operations on couples (as defined in [AC13b] for overholonomic complexes with Frobenius structure) as follows.

Let $\mathbb{Y} := (Y,X)$ be a couple over $\mathcal{V}$. Choose a frame of the form $(Y,X,\mathcal{P})$. Let $\mathfrak{C}(Y,\mathcal{P}/K)$ be the full subcategory of $\mathfrak{C}(\mathcal{P})$ of objects $\mathcal{E}$ such that there exists an isomorphism of the form $\mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{R}\underline{\Gamma}^{\dagger}_{Y}(\mathcal{E})$. The category $\mathfrak{C}(Y,\mathcal{P}/K)$ does not depend, up to a canonical equivalence of categories, on the choice of the proper frame $(Y,X,\mathcal{P})$ enclosing (Y,X). So, we can also simply write $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ instead of $\mathfrak{C}(Y,\mathcal{P}/K)$.

Let $\theta = (b,a,f)\colon (Y',X',\mathcal{P}') \to (Y,X,\mathcal{P})$ be a morphism of frames. Put $\mathbb{Y} := (Y,X)$ and $\mathbb{Y}' := (Y',X')$. The functor $\mathbb{R}\underline{\Gamma}^{\dagger}_{Y'} \circ f^{!}$ induces the factorization $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{Y}/K) \to \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{Y}'/K)$, which will be denoted by $\theta^{!}$ or $(b,a)^{!}$ (since, up to canonical equivalences of categories, this does not depend on the choice of θ enclosing (b,a)). The functor $\mathbb{R}\underline{\Gamma}^{\dagger}_{Y}\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{P}}\colon \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{Y}/K) \to \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ will be denoted by $\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{Y}}$. We get the pullbacks $\theta^{+} := \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{Y}'} \circ \theta^{!} \circ \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{Y}}$.

Suppose that θ is complete, i.e. that $a\colon X' \to X$ is proper. Then the functor f_{+} induces the factorization $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{Y}'/K) \to \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$, which will be denoted by θ_{+} or $(b,a)_{+}$. We denote by $\theta_{!} := \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{Y}} \circ \theta_{+} \circ \mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{Y}'}$, the extraordinary pushforward by θ.

If moreover the data of coefficients $\mathfrak{C}$ is stable under tensor products, then the bifunctor $-\overset{\mathbb{L}}{\otimes}{}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}}} - [-\dim P]$ has the factorization $\mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{Y}/K) \times \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{Y}/K) \to \mathfrak{C}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ and will be denoted by $\widetilde{\otimes}_{\mathbb{Y}}$. Hence, in that case, we get a formalism of Grothendieck's six operations.

Notation 1.3.2.

1. Following 1.2.2.4 and 1.2.2.5, the data of coefficients $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{ovhol}}$ and $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{h}}$ are stable under local cohomological functors, push-forwards, extraordinary pull-backs, duals. Hence, with the notation of 1.3.1, we get the categories of the form $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{h}}(Y,\mathcal{P}/K)$, $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{h}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$, $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{ovhol}}(Y,\mathcal{P}/K)$ or $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{ovhol}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ with five of Grothendieck cohomological operations (the tensor product is a priori missing).

2. Via the equivalence 1.1.3.1, the subcategory $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{P},\mathbb{Q}})$ corresponding to $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{h}}(Y,\mathcal{P}/K)$ will be denoted by $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{h}}(Y,\mathcal{P}/K)$ or by $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{h}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$.

3. From [AC13b, 1.2] (with the remark that the Frobenius structure is useless and that this commutes with base change), with the notation of 1.3.1, there is a canonical t-structure on $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{h}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$, whose heart, the category of overholonomic modules on $\mathbb{Y}/K$ after any base change, is denoted by $\mathrm{H}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$. Finally, we denote by $\mathcal{H}^{i}_{\mathrm{t}}$ the ith space of cohomology with respect to this canonical t-structure. With this canonical t-structure, for any integer $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, one get the subcategories $D^{\leqslant n}_{\mathrm{h}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ and $D^{\geqslant n}_{\mathrm{h}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$.

Proposition 1.3.3. *Let $\mathfrak{C}$ and $\mathfrak{D}$ be two data of coefficients. With the notation of 1.2.1, we have the following properties.*

1. *For any object $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V})$, for any quasi-proper smooth formal scheme $\mathfrak{X}$ over $\mathcal{W}$, if $\mathcal{O}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathfrak{X}} \in \mathfrak{D}(\mathfrak{X})$ (where $\mathcal{O}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathfrak{X}}$ is the constant object $\mathcal{O}^{(m)}_{\mathfrak{X}} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}$) then the category $S(\mathfrak{D},\mathfrak{C})(\mathfrak{X})$ is a full subcategory of $\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X})$.*

2. *Suppose that $\mathfrak{D}$ is stable under extraordinary pull-backs, base change and tensor products and that $\mathfrak{C}$ contains $\mathfrak{D}$. Then $S(\mathfrak{D},\mathfrak{C})$ contains $\mathfrak{D}$ and $S(S(\mathfrak{D},\mathfrak{C}),S(\mathfrak{D},\mathfrak{C}))$ contains $\mathfrak{D}$.*

3. *If the coefficients of $\mathfrak{C}$ are local (resp. stable under devissages, resp. stable under direct factors), then so are $\mathfrak{C}^{\vee}$ and $S(\mathfrak{D},\mathfrak{C})$.*

4. *The coefficients of $S(\mathfrak{D},\mathfrak{C})$ are stable under extraordinary pull-backs and under base change.*

5. *If $\mathfrak{D}$ contains $\mathfrak{D}_{\mathrm{cst}}$ (see the first example of 1.2.2), if $\mathfrak{D}$ is stable under tensor products and if $\mathfrak{C}$ or $\mathfrak{D}$ is stable by devissages then $S(\mathfrak{D},\mathfrak{C})$ is stable under local cohomological functors.*

6. *Suppose that $\mathfrak{C}$ is stable under push-forwards and that $\mathfrak{D}$ is stable under extraordinary pull-backs. Then the coefficients of $S(\mathfrak{D},\mathfrak{C})$ are stable under push-forwards.*

Proof. We check the fifth statement by using Mayer-Vietoris exact triangles (the check is identical to that of the stability of the overcoherence by local cohomological functors: for more details, see [Car04, 3.1.5]). The sixth one comes from 1.1.1.1, 1.1.1.2 and the commutation of the base change with push-forwards (see 1.1.2). The second one is a consequence of the commutation of the base change with extraordinary pull-backs and tensor products, (see 1.1.2). The other ones are obvious. □

Definition 1.3.4. Let $\mathfrak{D}$ be a data of coefficients. We say that $\mathfrak{D}$ is almost stable under dual functors if the following property holds: for any data of coefficients $\mathfrak{C}$ stable by devissages, direct factors and push-forwards, if $\mathfrak{D} \subset \mathfrak{C}$ then $\mathfrak{D} \subset \mathfrak{C}^{\vee}$.

Notation 1.3.5. Let $\mathfrak{C}, \mathfrak{D}$ be two data of coefficients. We put $T_0(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C}) := S(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C})$. By induction on $i \in \mathbb{N}$, we set $\widetilde{T}_i(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C}) := S(\mathfrak{D}, T_i(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C}) \cap T_i(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C})^{\vee})$ and $T_{i+1}(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C}) := S(\widetilde{T}_i(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C}), \widetilde{T}_i(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C}))$. We put $T(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C}) := \cap_{i \in \mathbb{N}} T_i(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C})$.

Proposition 1.3.6. *Let $\mathfrak{D}$ be a data of coefficients which contains $\mathfrak{D}_{\mathrm{cst}}$, which is stable under extraordinary pull-backs, base changes, tensor products and which is almost stable under dual functors. Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a data of coefficients containing $\mathfrak{D}$ and stable by devissages, direct factors and push-forwards. Then, the data of coefficients $T(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C})$ is included in $\mathfrak{C}$, contains $\mathfrak{D}$ and is stable by devissages, direct factors, local cohomological functors, push-forwards, extraordinary pull-backs, base changes, tensor products and duals.*

Proof. First, we check by induction on $i \in \mathbb{N}$ that the data of coefficients $T_i(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C})$ contains $\mathfrak{D}$ and is stable by devissages, direct factors, push-forwards, extraordinary pull-backs, base changes (which implies such stability property for $T(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C})$). From 1.3.3, this can be checked for $T_0(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C})$. Suppose that this is true for $T_i(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C})$ for some $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\mathfrak{D}$ is almost stable under duals, then $T_i(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C}) \cap T_i(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C})^{\vee}$ contains $\mathfrak{D}$. Since $\mathfrak{D}$ is stable by tensor products, extraordinary pull-backs, base changes and is contained in $\mathfrak{C}$, then using 1.3.3.2 we get that $\mathfrak{D}$ is contained in $T_{i+1}(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C})$. The stability of $\widetilde{T}_i(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C})$ and next of $T_{i+1}(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C})$ by devissages, direct factors, push-forwards, extraordinary pull-backs, base changes is a consequence of 1.3.3.

Since $T_{i+1}(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C})$ is contained in $\widetilde{T}_i(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C})$ and $\widetilde{T}_i(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C})$ is contained in $T_i(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C}) \cap T_i(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C})^{\vee}$, by construction, the tensor product of two objects of $T_{i+1}(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C})$ is an object of $T_i(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C})$ and the dual of an object of $T_{i+1}(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C})$ is an object of $T_i(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C})$. Hence, we get the stability under dual functors and tensor products of $T(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C})$. Then, using 1.3.3, we get the stability under local cohomological functors of $T(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C})$. □

Remark 1.3.7. We keep the notation and hypothesis of 1.3.6.

1. From 1.3.1, the proposition 1.3.6 gives a formalism of Grothendieck's six operations and base changes on couples. From the last remark of 1.2.3, we get that the data of coefficients $T(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C})$ is contained in $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{h}}$.

2. If the data of coefficients $\mathfrak{C}$ is local, then so is $T(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C})$.

Notation 1.3.8. Let $\mathfrak{D}$ and $\mathfrak{C}$ be two data of coefficients satisfying the hypotheses of the proposition 1.3.6. We suppose moreover that $\mathfrak{C}$ is local. We define the data of coefficients $T_{\max}(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C})$ (resp. $T_{\min}(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C})$) as follows: for any object $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V})$, for any quasi-proper smooth formal scheme $\mathfrak{X}$ over $\mathcal{W}$, the category $T_{\max}(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C})(\mathfrak{X})$ (resp. $T_{\min}(\mathfrak{D}, \mathfrak{C})(\mathfrak{X})$) is the full subcategory of $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{coh}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathfrak{X}})$ of objects $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}$ satisfying the following property :

($\star\star\star$) there exists a data of coefficients $\mathfrak{B}$ (resp. for any data of coefficients $\mathfrak{B}$) which is local, included in $\mathfrak{C}$, containing $\mathfrak{D}$ and stable by devissages, direct factors, local cohomological functors, push-forwards, extraordinary pull-backs, base changes, tensor products, duals and such that $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)} \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathfrak{X})$ (resp. we have $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)} \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathfrak{X})$).

1.4 Data of coefficients with potentially Frobenius structure over $\mathcal{V}$

Notation 1.4.1. We assume that the absolute Frobenius homomorphism $k \xrightarrow{\sim} k$ sending x to x^p lifts to an automorphism $\sigma\colon \mathcal{V} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{V}$. We denote by $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V}, \sigma)$ the full subcategory of $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V})$ whose objects $\mathcal{V} \to \mathcal{W}$ are such that the absolute Frobenius homomorphism of the residue field of $\mathcal{W}$ has a lifting of the form $\mathcal{W} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{W}$.

Similarly than 1.1.4, we introduce the following definition.

Definition 1.4.2. A *data of coefficients with potentially Frobenius structure* $\mathfrak{C}$ *over* $\mathcal{V}$ will be the data, for any object $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V},\sigma)$, for any quasi-proper smooth formal scheme $\mathfrak{X}$ over $\mathcal{W}$, of a full subcategory of $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{coh}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathfrak{X}})$, which will be denoted by $\mathfrak{C}(\mathfrak{X})$. If there is no ambiguity with $\mathcal{V}$, we simply say a *data of coefficients with potentially Frobenius structure* $\mathfrak{C}$.

As in 1.1.5, we define the notion of *local* data of coefficients with potentially Frobenius structure over $\mathcal{V}$, of its stability under extraordinary pull-backs, push-forwards, base change (of course, we restrict here to morphism in $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V},\sigma)$), devissage, tensor products, dual functors, local cohomological functors.

Remark 1.4.3. We notice that by definition, a data of coefficients over $\mathcal{V}$ induces by restriction a data of coefficients with potentially Frobenius structure $\mathfrak{C}$ over $\mathcal{V}$.

1.5 Constructible t-structure for overholonomic complexes after any base changes

For completeness (this will not be useful in this paper), we extend Tomoyuki Abe's definition of constructibility in the context of overholonomic complexes after any base changes by introducing a new way of defining it (i.e. by devissage).

1.5.1. Let $(Y,X,\mathcal{P})$ be a frame (over $\mathcal{V}$) such that Y is smooth and $Z := X \setminus Y$ is a divisor of X. We recall that $\mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}(Y,X/K)$ means the category of overcoherent isocrystal on $(Y,X,\mathcal{P})$ (see its construction in [Car11b]). This is a full subcategory of that of overcoherent $\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{P}}({}^{\dagger}Z)_{\mathbb{Q}}$-modules with support in X, which explains the terminology (see also the equivalence of categories 2.1.1.1). We also denote by $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{isoc}}(Y,X/K)$ the full subcategory of $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{ovcoh}}(\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{P}}({}^{\dagger}Z)_{\mathbb{Q}})$ whose cohomological spaces are objects of $\mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}(Y,X/K)$.

We recall that when $\mathcal{P}$ is proper, since these categories does not depend on X (because X is proper) up to canonical equivalences of categories, we can simply write them $\mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}(Y/K)$ and $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{isoc}}(Y/K)$.

We recall that because they have not necessary some Frobenius structure, the objects of $\mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}(Y,X/K)$ are not always (over)holonomic. Since the context of overholonomic complexes after any base change is a minimum (see the remark 1.3.7.1), this is the reason why we introduce the following categories.

Definition 1.5.2. Let $\mathbb{Y} := (Y,X)$ be a couple over $\mathcal{V}$ with Y smooth.

1. Choose $(\mathbb{Y},\mathcal{P})$ a frame and $\mathfrak{U}$ an open set of $\mathcal{P}$ such that Y is closed in $\mathfrak{U}$. Let $\mathcal{E} \in \mathrm{H}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ (see the notation of 1.3.2.3). We say that $\mathcal{E}$ is an overholonomic isocrystal on $\mathbb{Y}$ if $\mathcal{E}|\mathfrak{U} \in \mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}(Y,Y/K)$ (see the notation of [Car11b]) We denote by $\text{H-Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ the full subcategory of $\mathrm{H}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ whose objects are overholonomic isocrystals. This category $\text{H-Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ does not depend on the choice of the frame enclosing $\mathbb{Y}$, which justifies the notation.

2. Let $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\text{h-isoc}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ be the full subcategory of $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{h}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ of the objects $\mathcal{E}$ such that, for any integer i, the module $\mathcal{H}^i_{\mathrm{t}}(\mathcal{E}) \in \text{Ovhol-Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$, where $\mathcal{H}^i_{\mathrm{t}}$ means the ith spaces of cohomology with respect to the canonical t-structure (see the notation of 1.3.2.3). With the notation of 1.3.2.3, for any integer $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, one get the subcategories $D^{\leq n}_{\text{h-isoc}}(\mathbb{Y}/K) := D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\text{h-isoc}}(\mathbb{Y}/K) \cap D^{\leq n}_{\mathrm{h}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ and $D^{\geq n}_{\text{h-isoc}}(\mathbb{Y}/K) := D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\text{h-isoc}}(\mathbb{Y}/K) \cap D^{\geq n}_{\mathrm{h}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$.

3. We denote by $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{h-isoc}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ the full subcategory of $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{coh}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathcal{P}})$ of objects $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}$ such that $\varinjlim \mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)} \in D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\text{h-isoc}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$.

1.5.3 (Constructible t-structure)**.** Let $\mathbb{Y} := (Y,X)$ be a couple. Choose a frame $(Y,X,\mathcal{P})$. If $Y' \to Y$ is an immersion, then we denote by $i_{Y'} \colon (Y',X',\mathcal{P}) \to (Y,X,\mathcal{P})$ the induced morphism (where X' is the closure of Y' in X). We define on $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{h}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ the constructible t-structure as follows.

1. An object $\mathcal{E} \in D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{h}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ belongs to $D^{c,\geq 0}_{\mathrm{h}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ if there exists a smooth stratification $(Y_i)_{i=1,\ldots,r}$ of Y such that for any i, the complex $i^{+}_{Y_i}(\mathcal{E})[d_{Y_i}]$ belongs $D^{\geq 0}_{\text{h-isoc}}(Y_i,\mathcal{P}/K)$.

2. An object $\mathcal{E} \in D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{h}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ belongs to $D^{c,\leq 0}_{\mathrm{h}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ if there exists a smooth stratification $(Y_i)_{i=1,\ldots,r}$ of Y such that for any i, the complex $i^{+}_{Y_i}(\mathcal{E})[d_{Y_i}]$ belongs $D^{\leq 0}_{\text{h-isoc}}(Y_i,\mathcal{P}/K)$.

1.5.4. Let $\mathbb{Y} := (Y,X)$ be a couple.

1. Let $\mathcal{E}' \to \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}'' \to \mathcal{E}'[1]$ be an exact triangle in $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{h}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$. If $\mathcal{E}'$ and $\mathcal{E}''$are in $D^{c,\geq 0}_{\mathrm{h}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ (resp. $D^{c,\leq 0}_{\mathrm{h}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$) then so is $\mathcal{E}$.

2. Suppose that Y is smooth. Let $\mathcal{E} \in D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\text{h-isoc}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$. Then $\mathcal{E} \in D^{c,\geq 0}_{\mathrm{h}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ (resp. $\mathcal{E} \in D^{c,\leq 0}_{\mathrm{h}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$) if and only if $\mathcal{E} \in D^{\geq d_X}_{\text{h-isoc}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ (resp. $\mathcal{E} \in D^{\leq d_X}_{\text{h-isoc}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$).

Remark 1.5.5. Let $\mathbb{Y} := (Y,X)$ be a couple such that X is proper. Then, the categories $D^{c,\geq 0}_{\mathrm{h}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ and $D^{c,\leq 0}_{\mathrm{h}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ only depend on Y and can be simply denoted by $D^{c,\geq 0}_{\mathrm{h}}(Y/K)$ and $D^{c,\leq 0}_{\mathrm{h}}(Y/K)$. This constructible t-structure defined is compatible with that defined by Tomoyuki Abe in [Abe13, 1.3.1] (more precisely, one can check that, if we restrict to the categories denoted there by $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{hol}}(Y/K)$, we get Tomoyuki Abe's definition of constructibility). Indeed, let $\mathcal{E} \in D^{\geq 0}_{\text{h-isoc}}(Y/K)$. For any immersion i of realizable varieties, Tomoyuki Abe's definition of $D^{c,\geq 0}_{\mathrm{hol}}$ and of $D^{c,\leq 0}_{\mathrm{hol}}$ are stable by i^+ and under $i_!$. Since this property is obvious with the definition of 1.5.3, by devissage in overconvergent isocrystals, we reduce to the case where there exists a smooth subvariety Z of Y and an object $\mathcal{G} \in D^{\geq 0}_{\text{h-isoc}}(Z/K)$ such that $\mathcal{E} = i_{Z!}(\mathcal{G})$. In that case, this is clear that both definition of $D^{\geq 0}_{\text{h-isoc}}(Y/K)$ are the same. We proceed in the same way for $D^{\leq 0}_{\text{h-isoc}}(Y/K)$.

2 Around unipotence

2.1 Σ-unipotent monodromy

Definition 2.1.1. Let $(Y,X,\mathcal{P})$ be a frame (over $\mathcal{V}$). We suppose that X is smooth, $Z := X - Y$ is a simple normal crossing divisor of X and let $Z = \cup_{i=1}^{r} Z_i$ be the decomposition of Z into irreducible components. We put $\mathbb{Y} := (Y,X)$.

1. We recall that from [Car11b], we have the equivalence of categories of the form

$$\mathrm{sp}_+ \cong \mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger}(\mathbb{Y}/K) \cong \mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}(\mathbb{Y}/K), \tag{2.1.1.1}$$

   where the category $\mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ is Berthelot's category of overconvergent isocrystal on $\mathbb{Y}$. Let $\mathcal{E} \in \mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$. We will say that $\mathcal{E}$ has Σ-unipotent monodromy if the corresponding overconvergent isocrystal $E \in \mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ via the equivalence 2.1.1.1 has Σ^r-unipotent monodromy according to Shiho's definition [Shi10, 3.9] (and its remark). We denote by $\mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}_{\Sigma}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ the full subcategory of $\mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ whose objects "have Σ-unipotent monodromy". We remark that the category $\mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}_{\Sigma}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ is independent on the choice of $\mathcal{P}$.

2. Let $\mathcal{E} \in D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{isoc}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$. We say that $\mathcal{E}$ "has Σ-unipotent monodromy" if, for any integer i, the module $\mathcal{H}^i(\mathcal{E})$ has Σ-unipotent monodromy (recall that, since Z is a divisor of X, then $\mathcal{H}^i(\mathcal{E}) = \mathcal{H}^i_{\mathrm{t}}(\mathcal{E})$). We will denote by $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{isoc},\Sigma}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ the full subcategory of $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{isoc}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ whose objects have Σ-unipotent monodromy.

3. We denote by $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{isoc},\Sigma}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ the full subcategory of $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{coh}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathcal{P}})$ of objects $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}$ such that $\varinjlim \mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)} \in D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{isoc},\Sigma}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$.

2.1.2. Let $\theta = (b,a,f)\colon (Y',X',\mathcal{P}') \to (Y,X,\mathcal{P})$ be a morphism of frames over $\mathcal{V}$. We suppose that X and X' are smooth, $Z := X - Y$ (resp. $Z' := X' - Y'$) is a simple normal crossing divisor of X (resp. X'). We put $\mathbb{Y} := (Y,X)$ and $\mathbb{Y}' := (Y',X')$. Using [CT12, 1.1.3.1] and [Shi10, 3.16] (or better [Shi10, 3.17]), we check that we get the factorization

$$\theta^! = \mathbb{R}\underline{\Gamma}^{\dagger}_{Y'} f^!\colon D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{isoc},\Sigma}(\mathbb{Y}/K) \to D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{isoc},\Sigma}(\mathbb{Y}'/K), \tag{2.1.2.1}$$

and a similar one by replacing "D" by "$\underrightarrow{LD}_{\mathbb{Q}}$".

2.1.3. Let $(Y,X,\mathcal{P})$ be a frame over $\mathcal{V}$. We suppose that X is smooth, $Z := X - Y$ is a simple normal crossing divisor of X.

1. The category $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{isoc},\Sigma}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ is stable under base change, i.e. for any object $\mathcal{W}$ of $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V})$ with field of fraction K', for any $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)} \in \underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{isoc},\Sigma}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$, putting $(Y',X',\mathcal{P}')$ the frame over $\mathcal{W}$ induced by base change from $(Y,X,\mathcal{P})$, we get $\mathcal{W}\overset{\mathbb{L}}{\otimes}{}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{V}}\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)} \in \underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{isoc},\Sigma}(Y',X'/K')$.

2. Let $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}, \mathcal{F}^{(\bullet)} \in \underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{isoc},\Sigma}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ and let $\mathcal{E} := \varinjlim \mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}$, $\mathcal{F} := \varinjlim \mathcal{F}^{(\bullet)}$. We check that
$$\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}\overset{\mathbb{L}}{\otimes}{}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}}}\mathcal{F}^{(\bullet)} \in \underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{isoc},\Sigma}(\mathbb{Y}/K).$$
Indeed, using 2.1.5, by devissage, we can suppose that $\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ are in fact objects of $\mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}_{\Sigma}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$. Denoting by $\otimes$ the usual tensor product of $\mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ (this corresponds to the Berthelot's tensor product of overconvergent isocrystals). Using [Shi10, 3.16] (or better [Shi10, 3.17]), we get that $\mathcal{E}$ (resp. $\mathcal{F}$) comes from a log convergent isocrystal $\mathcal{G}_1$ (resp. $\mathcal{G}_2$). If $\mathrm{Exp}(\mathcal{G}_1)$ and $\mathrm{Exp}(\mathcal{G}_2)$ are the exponents of respectively $\mathcal{G}_1$ and $\mathcal{G}_2$ then the exponents of $\mathcal{G}_1\otimes\mathcal{G}_2$ is $\mathrm{Exp}(\mathcal{G}_1)+\mathrm{Exp}(\mathcal{G}_2)$. Hence, again using [Shi10, 3.16], we get that $\mathcal{E}\otimes\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}_{\Sigma}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$. This implies the isomorphism (for instance, see [Car08]):
$$\varinjlim \left(\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}\overset{\mathbb{L}}{\otimes}{}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}}}\mathcal{F}^{(\bullet)}\right) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{E}\otimes\mathcal{F}. \tag{2.1.3.1}$$

2.1.4. From [CT12, 2.3.13] and [Shi10, 3.16] (or better [Shi10, 3.17]), with the stability under base change of 2.1.3.1, we obtain that the category $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{isoc},\Sigma}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ (resp. $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{isoc},\Sigma}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$) is a full subcategory of $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\text{h-isoc}}(Y/K)$ (resp. $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{h-isoc}}(Y/K)$).

Proposition 2.1.5. *We keep the notation and hypotheses of 2.1.1.*

1. *The category* $\mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}_{\Sigma}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ *is a Serre subcategory of* $\mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ *closed under duals and tensor products.*
2. *The category* $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{isoc},\Sigma}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ *(resp.* $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{isoc},\Sigma}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$*) is a triangle subcategory of* $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{h}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathcal{P}})$ *(resp.* $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{h}}(Y,\mathcal{P}/K)$*).*
3. *A direct factor in* $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{coh}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathcal{P}})$ *of an object of* $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{isoc},\Sigma}$ *is an object of* $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{isoc},\Sigma}$*.*

Proof. The second part is a consequence of the first one (and of 2.1.4). For the stability under extension of the first assertion, we proceed as Kedlaya in [Ked07, 6.5.1] (the only difference is to replace in the proof [Ked07, 6.4.5] by the equivalence of Shiho [Shi10, 3.16]). We check the other properties without difficulty. □

Definition 2.1.6. Let $\mathcal{W}$ be an object of $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V})$, $\mathcal{P}$ be a quasi-proper smooth formal scheme over $\mathcal{W}$. We denote by $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\Sigma}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathcal{P}})$ the smallest subcategory of $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{h}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathcal{P}})$ stable by devissages and containing the categories of the form $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{isoc},\Sigma}(Y,\overline{Y}/K)$ where $\overline{Y}$ is a closed smooth subvariety of P, Y is an open of $\overline{Y}$ such that $\overline{Y}\setminus Y$ is a strict normal crossing divisor in Y (thanks to the Proposition 2.1.5, this is concretely defined as in [Car07, 3.2.21]). We call the objects of $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\Sigma}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathcal{P}})$ as those of $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{h}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathcal{P}})$ "having Σ-unipotent monodromy". Finally, we denote by $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\Sigma}(\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{P}\mathbb{Q}})$ the essential image of the functor $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\Sigma}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathcal{P}}) \to D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{h}}(\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{P}\mathbb{Q}})$ induced by 1.1.3.1.

Theorem 2.1.7. *Let* $\mathcal{W}$ *be an object of* $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V})$*,* $\mathcal{P}$ *be a quasi-proper smooth formal scheme over* $\mathcal{W}$*. The dual functor* $\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{P}}$ *induces an autoequivalence of* $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\Sigma}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathcal{P}})$ *(resp. of* $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\Sigma}(\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{P}\mathbb{Q}})$*).*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F} \in D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\Sigma}(\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{P}\mathbb{Q}})$. By devissage, we can suppose that there exists a frame $(Y,\overline{Y},\mathcal{P})$ where $\overline{Y}$ is smooth, $D := \overline{Y}\setminus Y$ is a strict normal crossing divisor of $\overline{Y}$, and there exists $\mathcal{E} \in D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{isoc},\Sigma}(Y,\overline{Y}/K)$ such that $j_+\mathcal{E} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{F}$, where $j\colon Y \hookrightarrow P$ is the immersion (here j_+ means simply the inclusion of $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{h}}(Y,\mathcal{P}/K)$ in $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{h}}(\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{P}\mathbb{Q}})$ but we keep it in the notation to be precise). By devissage, we can suppose that $\mathcal{E} \in \mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}_{\Sigma}(Y,\overline{Y}/K)$. From the remark [Shi10, 3.17], there exists a convergent log isocrystals $\mathcal{G}$ on the log scheme $(\overline{Y},M_D)$, where M_D is the log-structure induced by D, with exponents in $\tau(\Sigma)$ such that $({}^{\dagger}D)(\mathcal{G}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{E}$. Since $\tau(0)=0$, from [CT12, 2.2.9] (or [Car12a, 3.5.6.2]), we have $j_+(\mathcal{E}) = \alpha_+(\mathcal{G})$, where $\alpha\colon (\overline{Y},M_D) \to \overline{Y}$ is the canonical morphism of log-schemes. Then, and with [Car09b, 5.24.(ii)] for the last isomorphism, we get $\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{P}}\circ j_+(\mathcal{E}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \alpha_!(\mathcal{G}^{\vee}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \alpha_+(\mathcal{G}^{\vee}(-\mathcal{Z}))$. From [Car12a, 3.5.6], we get that $\alpha_+(\mathcal{G}^{\vee}(-\mathcal{Z})) \in D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\Sigma}(\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{P}\mathbb{Q}})$ (with the remark that the exponents stay in Σ). Hence, $\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{F}) \in D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\Sigma}(\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{P}\mathbb{Q}})$.

□

2.2 Potentially Σ-unipotent monodromy

Definition 2.2.1. Let $\mathbb{Y} := (Y,X)$ be a couple over $\mathcal{V}$ such that Y is smooth over k. Choose a frame over $\mathcal{V}$ of the form $(Y,X,\mathcal{P})$.

1. Let $\mathcal{E} \in \mathrm{H}(Y,\mathcal{P}/K)$. We say that $\mathcal{E}$ is an isocrystal on $\mathbb{Y}$ having "potentially Σ-unipotent monodromy" if $\mathcal{E} \in \text{H-Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}(Y,\mathcal{P}/K)$ (see the notation of 1.5.2) and if, for any irreducible component Y_1 of Y, denoting by X_1 the closure of Y_1 in X, there exists a morphism of frames over $\mathcal{V}$ of the form $\theta = (b,a,f)\colon (Y',X',\mathcal{P}') \to (Y_1,X_1,\mathcal{P})$ such that $a\colon X' \to X_1$ is a projective surjective generically finite and etale morphism, $Y' = a^{-1}(Y)$, X' is smooth, $X' \setminus Y'$ is a simple normal crossing divisor of X' and $\theta^!(\mathcal{E}) \in \mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}_{\Sigma}(Y',X'/K)$.

   We denote by $\mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}_{\text{pot-}\Sigma}(Y,\mathcal{P}/K)$ the full subcategory of $\mathrm{H}(Y,\mathcal{P}/K)$ whose objects are isocrystals having potentially Σ-unipotent monodromy. since the category $\mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}_{\text{pot-}\Sigma}(Y,\mathcal{P}/K)$ does not depend on the choice of the frame $(Y,X,\mathcal{P})$ enclosing $\mathbb{Y}$, we will also write $\mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}_{\text{pot-}\Sigma}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ instead of $\mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}_{\text{pot-}\Sigma}(Y,\mathcal{P}/K)$.

2. Let $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\text{isoc,pot-}\Sigma}(Y,\mathcal{P}/K)$ be the full subcategory of $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{h}}(Y,\mathcal{P}/K)$ of the objects $\mathcal{E}$ such that, for any integer i, we have $\mathcal{H}^i_{\mathrm{t}}(\mathcal{E}) \in \mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}_{\text{pot-}\Sigma}(Y,\mathcal{P}/K)$. We can also write $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\text{isoc,pot-}\Sigma}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ instead of $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\text{isoc,pot-}\Sigma}(Y,\mathcal{P}/K)$.

3. We denote by $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{isoc,pot-}\Sigma}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ the full subcategory of $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{coh}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathcal{P}})$ of objects $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}$ such that $\varinjlim \mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)} \in D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\text{isoc,pot-}\Sigma}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$.

Remark 2.2.2. The following remarks should justify our notation above.

1. Let $(Y,X,\mathcal{P})$ be a frame such that Y is irreducible and smooth, $X \setminus Y$ is a divisor of X. Let $\mathcal{E} \in \mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}(Y,X/K)$ (see the notation of 1.5.1). If there exists a morphism of frames over $\mathcal{V}$ of the form $\theta = (b,a,f)\colon (Y',X',\mathcal{P}') \to (Y,X,\mathcal{P})$ such that $a\colon X' \to X$ is a projective surjective generically finite and etale morphism, X' is smooth, $Z' := X' \setminus Y'$ is a simple normal crossing divisor of X' and $\theta^!(\mathcal{E}) \in \mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}_{\Sigma}(Y',X'/K)$, then $\mathcal{E} \in \mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}_{\text{pot-}\Sigma}(Y,X/K)$.

   Proof : Since $a^!(\mathcal{E}) \in D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\text{h-isoc}}(Y',X'/K)$ (see 2.1.4) and then in particular $\theta^!(\mathcal{E}) \in D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{h}}(Y',X'/K)$, since $\mathcal{E}$ is a direct factor of $a_+a^!(\mathcal{E})$, then we get that $\mathcal{E} \in \mathrm{H}(Y,X/K)$.

2. Let $\mathbb{Y} = (Y,X)$ be a couple over $\mathcal{V}$ where Y is k-smooth. Suppose in this remark that the absolute Frobenius homomorphism $k \xrightarrow{\sim} k$ sending x to x^p lifts to an automorphism of the form $\mathcal{V} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{V}$. In that case, in [AC13b, 1.2.13], we have defined the category F-$\mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ (also notice that compared to 1.5.1, which is the situation of [Car11b], we do not need the hypothesis that $X \setminus Y$ is a divisor of X). We can translate Kedlaya's semistable reduction theorem of [Ked11] as follows: if $\mathcal{E}$ is an object of F-$\mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ then $\mathcal{E} \in \mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}_{\text{pot-}\Sigma}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ (for $\Sigma = 0$ and then for any Σ satisfying the convention of the paper).

2.2.3. Let $\theta = (b,f)\colon (Y',\mathcal{P}') \to (Y,\mathcal{P})$ be a morphism of frames. We suppose that Y and Y' are smooth. By using 2.1.2 and de Jong desingularization theorem (see [dJ96]), we get the factorization

$$\theta^! = \mathbb{R}\underline{\Gamma}^{\dagger}_{Y'} f^! \colon \underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{isoc,pot-}\Sigma}(Y,\mathcal{P}/K) \to \underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{isoc,pot-}\Sigma}(Y',\mathcal{P}'/K). \tag{2.2.3.1}$$

Moreover, using 2.1.2, 2.1.5 and de Jong desingularization theorem we check that $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{isoc,pot-}\Sigma}(Y,\mathcal{P}/K)$ is a triangle subcategory of $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{h}}(Y,\mathcal{P}/K)$. The stability under direct factors of $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{isoc,pot-}\Sigma}(Y,\mathcal{P}/K)$ is a consequence of 2.1.5. Finally, with 2.1.3.1, we establish that the categories of the form $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{isoc,pot-}\Sigma}(Y,\mathcal{P}/K)$ are stable under base change. We have similar properties by replacing "$\underrightarrow{LD}_{\mathbb{Q}}$" by "$D$".

Definition 2.2.4. Let $\mathbb{Y} := (Y,X)$ be a couple. Choose a frame $(Y,X,\mathcal{P})$.

1. Let $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)} \in \underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{h}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathcal{P}})$. We say that $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}$ has "potentially Σ-unipotent monodromy" if there exist a smooth stratification $(Y_0,\dots,Y_r)$ of the special fiber of $\mathcal{P}$ such that $\mathbb{R}\underline{\Gamma}^{\dagger}_{Y_i}(\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}) \in \underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{isoc,pot-}\Sigma}(Y_i,\mathcal{P}/K)$. We denote by $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{pot-}\Sigma}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathcal{P}})$ or $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{pot-}\Sigma}(\mathcal{P})$ the full subcategory of $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{h}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathcal{P}})$ whose objects have potentially Σ-unipotent monodromy.

2. We denote by $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{pot-}\Sigma}(Y,\mathcal{P}/K)$ or by $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{pot-}\Sigma}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ the full category of $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{pot-}\Sigma}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathcal{P}})$ of objects $\mathcal{E}$ such that there exists an isomorphism of the form $\mathcal{E}\xrightarrow{\sim}\mathbb{R}\underline{\Gamma}^{\dagger}_{Y}(\mathcal{E})$. From the remark of 1.5.2, we check that $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{pot-}\Sigma}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ does not depend on the choice of the frame enclosing $\mathbb{Y}$, which justify the notation.

3. We put $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\text{pot-}\Sigma}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ the essential image of the functor $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{pot-}\Sigma}(\mathbb{Y}/K)\to D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{coh}}(\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{P}\mathbb{Q}})$ induced by 1.1.3.1. We say that $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\text{pot-}\Sigma}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ is the full subcategory of $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{h}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ of objects having "potentially Σ-unipotent monodromy".

4. When $\Sigma=0$, we denote respectively $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{pot-}\Sigma}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ and $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\text{pot-}\Sigma}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ by $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{u}}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$ and $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{u}(\mathbb{Y}/K)$.

5. We get some data of coefficients $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{pot-}\Sigma}$, $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{u}}$ defined by posing $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{pot-}\Sigma}(\mathcal{P}):=\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{pot-}\Sigma}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathcal{P}})$, $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{u}}(\mathcal{P}):=\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{u}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathcal{P}})$.

2.2.5. Let $\mathbb{Y}:=(Y,X)$ be a couple. Choose a frame $(Y,X,\mathcal{P})$. Let $Y'\to Y$ be an immersion. With the notation of 1.5.3, this is straightforward by definition that, for any $\mathcal{E}\in D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\text{pot-}\Sigma}(Y',X'/K)$, we have $i_{Y'+}(\mathcal{E})\in D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\text{pot-}\Sigma}(Y,X/K)$.

Proposition 2.2.6. *The data of coefficients $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{pot-}\Sigma}$ is stable by devissages, direct factors and base change.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a quasi-proper smooth formal scheme over $\mathcal{V}$. Let $\mathcal{E}'\to\mathcal{E}\to\mathcal{E}''\to\mathcal{E}'[1]$ be an exact triangle of $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{h}}(\mathcal{P}/K)$ with $\mathcal{E}',\mathcal{E}''\in D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\text{pot-}\Sigma}(\mathcal{P}/K)$. By using 2.2.3.1 and de Jong desingularization theorem, we get a smooth stratification $(Y_1,\dots,Y_r)$ of the special fiber of $\mathcal{P}$ such that we get simultanously $\mathbb{R}\underline{\Gamma}^{\dagger}_{Y_i,\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{E}'),\mathbb{R}\underline{\Gamma}^{\dagger}_{Y_i,\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{E}'')\in D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\text{isoc,pot-}\Sigma}(Y_i,\mathcal{P}/K)$. Hence, using 2.2.3, we get $\mathbb{R}\underline{\Gamma}^{\dagger}_{Y_i,\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{E})\in D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\text{isoc,pot-}\Sigma}(Y_i,\mathcal{P}/K)$, which gives the stability of $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{pot-}\Sigma}$ by devissages. The rest of the proposition is a consequence of 2.2.3. □

2.2.7. Let $\theta=(b,f)\colon(Y',\mathcal{P}')\to(Y,\mathcal{P})$ be a morphism of frames. From 2.2.3.1 and 2.2.6, we get by devissage the factorization

$$\theta^{!}=\mathbb{R}\underline{\Gamma}^{\dagger}_{Y'}f^{!}\colon\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{pot-}\Sigma}(Y,\mathcal{P}/K)\to\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{pot-}\Sigma}(Y',\mathcal{P}'/K),\tag{2.2.7.1}$$

and a similar one by replacing "$\underrightarrow{LD}_{\mathbb{Q}}$" by "$D$".

2.2.8 (Tensor products)**.** Let $(Y,\mathcal{P})$ be a frame with Y smooth. By descent from the stability property of 2.1.3 (we proceed similarly as in 2.2.2.1, but since there are two objects, one also need 2.1.2.1 and de Jong desingularization theorem), we get the following stability property: for any $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)},\mathcal{F}^{(\bullet)}\in\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{isoc,pot-}\Sigma}(Y,\mathcal{P}/K)$, we have $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}\overset{\mathbb{L}}{\otimes}{}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{P}}}\mathcal{F}^{(\bullet)}\in\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{isoc,pot-}\Sigma}(Y,\mathcal{P}/K)$. Using 2.2.6, we get by devissage the stability of $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\Sigma}$ under tensor products.

Proposition 2.2.9. *Let $f\colon X\to Y$ be a finite étale surjective morphism of realizable varieties. Let $\mathcal{E}\in D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{h}}(X/K)$, $\mathcal{F}\in D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{h}}(Y/K)$.*

1. *We have $\mathcal{E}\in D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\text{pot-}\Sigma}(X/K)$ if and only if $f_{+}(\mathcal{E})\in D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\text{pot-}\Sigma}(Y/K)$. We have $\mathcal{F}\in D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\text{pot-}\Sigma}(Y/K)$) if and only if $f^{!}(\mathcal{F})\in D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\text{pot-}\Sigma}(X/K)$.*

2. *Suppose Y is smooth. We have $\mathcal{E}\in D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\text{isoc,pot-}\Sigma}(X/K)$ if and only if $f_{+}(\mathcal{E})\in D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\text{isoc,pot-}\Sigma}(Y/K)$. We have $\mathcal{F}\in D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\text{isoc,pot-}\Sigma}(Y/K)$) if and only if $f^{!}(\mathcal{F})\in D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\text{isoc,pot-}\Sigma}(X/K)$.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{E}$ is a direct factor of $f^{!}f_{+}(\mathcal{E})$, the proof is easy. By devissage (see 2.2.6), we can suppose that Y is smooth and then that the varieties are integral. By devissage, we can suppose that there exists a subvariety X' of X such that $\mathcal{E}\in D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\text{isoc,pot-}\Sigma}(X'/K)$ (this category is canonically included in $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\text{pot-}\Sigma}(X/K)$). There exists a Galois morphism $X'\to Y$ that factors through $f\colon X\to Y$. Denote by $g\colon X'\to X$ this factorization and put $h:=f\circ g$. Since $\mathcal{E}$ is a direct factor of $g_{+}g^{!}(\mathcal{E})$, then $f_{+}(\mathcal{E})$ is a direct factor of $h_{+}g^{!}(\mathcal{E})$. Hence, by using 2.1.5, we can suppose that f is a Galois morphism. Let p_1,p_2 be the left and right projection $X\times_Y X\to X$. Since $p_{2+}p_1^{!}(\mathcal{E})$ are the direct sum of $\sigma^{!}\mathcal{E}$, with σ an automorphism of Y over X, we get $p_{2+}p_1^{!}(\mathcal{E})\in D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\Sigma}(Y/K)$. Since $p_2^{!}f_{+}(\mathcal{E})\xrightarrow{\sim}p_{2+}p_1^{!}(\mathcal{E})$ and p_2 is finite and etale, this implies that $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\Sigma}(X/K)$.

□

Lemma 2.2.10. *The data of coefficients $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},pot\text{-}\Sigma}$ is almost stable by dual functors.*

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be a data of coefficients containing $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{pot-}\Sigma}$ and stable under devissages, under direct factors and under push-forwards. Let $\mathcal{W}$ be an object of $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V})$, $\mathcal{P}$ be a quasi-proper smooth formal scheme over $\mathcal{W}$. Let $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)} \in \underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{pot-}\Sigma}(\mathcal{P})$. We have to check that $\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}) \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathcal{P})$. Since $\mathfrak{C}$ is stable by devissages, we can suppose there exist an irreducible smooth subvariety Y of P such that $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)} \in \underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{isoc},\text{pot-}\Sigma}(Y,\mathcal{P}/K)$. Again by devissage, we can suppose that $\mathcal{E} := \varinjlim \mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)} \in \mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}_{\text{pot-}\Sigma}(Y/K)$, where $\varinjlim$ is the functor of 1.1.3.1. We denote by $\overline{Y}$ the closure of Y in P. There exists a morphism of frames $\theta = (b,a,f)\colon (Y',\overline{Y'},\mathcal{P}') \to (Y,\overline{Y},\mathcal{P})$ such that f is proper, a is generically finite and etale, $\overline{Y'}$ is smooth, $Y' = a^{-1}(Y)$, $\overline{Y'}\setminus Y'$ of a strict normal crossing divisor in $\overline{Y'}$ and $\theta^!(\mathcal{E}) = \mathbb{R}\underline{\Gamma}^{\dagger}_{Y'} f^!(\mathcal{E}) \in \mathrm{Isoc}^{\dagger\dagger}_{\Sigma}(Y',\overline{Y'}/K)$. From 2.1.7, we get $\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{P}'}\theta^!(\mathcal{E}) \in \underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\Sigma}(\mathcal{P}') \subset \underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{pot-}\Sigma}(\mathcal{P}') \subset \mathfrak{C}(\mathcal{P}')$. Since $\mathcal{E}$ is a direct factor of $\theta_+ \circ \theta^!(\mathcal{E})$, by using the relative duality isomorphism we check that $\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{E})$ is a direct factor of $\theta_+ \circ \mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{P}'}\theta^!(\mathcal{E})$. Since $\mathfrak{C}$ is stable by direct factors and push-forwards, this yields $\mathbb{D}_{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{E}) \in \mathfrak{C}(\mathcal{P})$.

□

2.3 Quasi-unipotence, coefficients satisfying semi-stable reduction property

Definition 2.3.1. From 2.2.6, 2.2.7, 2.2.8, 2.2.10, the data of coefficients $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{pot-}\Sigma}$ satisfies the hypotheses of 1.3.6 concerning the data $\mathfrak{D}$. Since $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{coh}}$ is local, stable by direct factors, devissages and push-forwards, then we can define $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{q-}\Sigma} := T_{\min}(\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{pot-}\Sigma}, \underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{coh}})$. When $\Sigma = 0$, we put $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{qu}} := \underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{q-}\Sigma}$. The objects of the coefficients of $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{q-}\Sigma}$ (resp. $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{qu}}$) are called "quasi-$\Sigma$-unipotent" (resp. "quasi-unipotent"). We also say that they "have quasi-Σ-unipotent monodromy".

Notation 2.3.2. We define the data of coefficients with potentially Frobenius structure $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},F}$ as follows. Let $\mathcal{W}$ be an object of $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V},\sigma)$, $\mathfrak{X}$ be a quasi-proper smooth formal scheme over $\mathcal{W}$. The category $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},F}(\mathfrak{X})$ is by definition the essential image of the canonical functor which forgets Frobenius structures : $F\text{-}\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{surcoh}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathfrak{X}}) \to \underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{surcoh}}(\widehat{\mathcal{D}}^{(\bullet)}_{\mathfrak{X}})$.

Remark 2.3.3. Let $\mathcal{W}$ be an object of $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V},\sigma)$, $\mathfrak{X}$ be a quasi-proper smooth formal scheme over $\mathcal{W}$. From Kedlaya's semistable reduction theorem (see 2.2.2.2), we remark that $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},F}(\mathfrak{X})$ is contained on $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{u}}(\mathfrak{X})$ (recall the notation of 2.2.4), which is at its turn contained in $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{h}}(\mathfrak{X})$.

Notation 2.3.4.

1. We define the data of coefficients with potentially Frobenius structure $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{u}^+}$ as follows. Let $\mathcal{W}$ be an object of $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V},\sigma)$, $\mathfrak{X}$ be a quasi-proper smooth formal scheme over $\mathcal{W}$. The category $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{u}^+}(\mathfrak{X})$ is the full subcategory of $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{u}}(\mathfrak{X})$ of complexes $\mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}$ satisfying the following property: for any morphism $\alpha\colon \mathcal{W} \to \mathcal{W}'$ of $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V},\sigma)$, for any proper morphism of quasi-proper smooth formal $\mathcal{W}'$-schemes of the form $g\colon \mathfrak{X} \times_{\mathrm{Spf}(\mathcal{W})} \mathrm{Spf}\,\mathcal{W}' \to \mathcal{Y}'$, we have $g_+(\mathcal{W}' \overset{\mathbb{L}}{\otimes}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{W}} \mathcal{E}^{(\bullet)}) \in \underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{u}}(\mathcal{Y}')$.
2. The construction of $T_{\max}$ and $T_{\min}$ in 1.3.8 are still valid if we restrict to data of coefficients with potentially Frobenius structure instead of data of coefficients. From [CT12], the data $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},F}$ satisfies the hypotheses of 1.3.6 concerning the data $\mathfrak{D}$. Moreover, the data $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{u}^+}$ is local, stable by devissages, direct factors and push-forwards (recall that base change commutes with push-forward from 1.1.2). Hence, we get the following data of coefficients with potentially Frobenius structure by putting $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{st}} := T_{\max}(\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},F}, \underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{u}^+})$.

2.3.5. Let $\mathcal{W}$ be an object of $\mathrm{DVR}(\mathcal{V},\sigma)$ and $\mathcal{P}$ be a quasi-proper smooth formal scheme over $\mathcal{W}$. We denote by $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\text{q-}\Sigma}(\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{P}\mathbb{Q}})$ (resp. $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{qu}}(\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{P}\mathbb{Q}})$ resp. $D^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathrm{st}}(\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}_{\mathcal{P}\mathbb{Q}})$) the essential image of $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\text{q-}\Sigma}(\mathcal{P})$ (resp. $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{qu}}(\mathcal{P})$, resp. $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{st}}(\mathcal{P})$) by the the functor $\varinjlim$ of 1.1.3.1

Remark 2.3.6.

1. The data of coefficients $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{st}}$ contains $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},F}$ and is contained in $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{u}}$. In particular, the isocrystals in $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{st}}$ satisfy Kedlaya's semistable reduction theorem.

2. We get Beilinson's unipotent nearby cycles similarly as in [AC13a] with the data $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{st}}$. Indeed, the main ingredient was Kedlaya's semistable reduction theorem, which is by construction satisfied by the coefficients belonging to $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{st}}$.

3. From 2.2.6, 2.2.7, 2.2.8, 2.2.10, we remark that if the data of coefficients $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{u}}$ is stable under push-forwards (which is unlikely but this remains an open question), then we get $\underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{u}} = \underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{u}^+} = \underrightarrow{LD}^{\mathrm{b}}_{\mathbb{Q},\mathrm{st}}$.

References

[Abe13] T. ABE – "Langlands correspondence for isocrystals and existence of crystalline companion for curves", (2013).

[Abe14] T. ABE – "Explicit calculation of Frobenius isomorphisms and Poincaré duality in the theory of arithmetic $\mathcal{D}$-modules", *Rend. Semin. Mat. Univ. Padova* **131** (2014), p. 89–149.

[AC13a] T. ABE et D. CARO – "On beilinson's equivalence for p-adic cohomology", (2013).

[AC13b] — , "Theory of weights in p-adic cohomology", (2013).

[Ber96] P. BERTHELOT – "-modules arithmétiques. I. Opérateurs différentiels de niveau fini", *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)* **29** (1996), no. 2, p. 185–272.

[Ber02] — , "Introduction à la théorie arithmétique des $\mathcal{D}$-modules", *Astérisque* (2002), no. 279, p. 1–80, Cohomologies p-adiques et applications arithmétiques, II.

[Car04] D. CARO – "$\mathcal{D}$-modules arithmétiques surcohérents. Application aux fonctions L", *Ann. Inst. Fourier, Grenoble* **54** (2004), no. 6, p. 1943–1996.

[Car07] — , "Overconvergent F-isocrystals and differential overcoherence", *Invent. Math.* **170** (2007), no. 3, p. 507–539.

[Car08] — , "Sur la stabilité par produits tensoriels des F-complexes de $\mathcal{D}$-modules arithmétiques", (A paraître dans Manuscripta Matematica).

[Car09a] — , "$\mathcal{D}$-modules arithmétiques surholonomes", *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)* **42** (2009), no. 1, p. 141–192.

[Car09b] — , "Overconvergent log-isocrystals and holonomy. (Log-isocristaux surconvergents et holonomie.)", *Compos. Math.* **145** (2009), no. 6, p. 1465–1503.

[Car11a] — , "La surcohérence entraîne l'holonomie", *ArXiv Mathematics e-prints* (2011).

[Car11b] — , "Pleine fidélité sans structure de Frobenius et isocristaux partiellement surconvergents", *Math. Ann.* **349** (2011), p. 747–805.

[Car12a] — , "Sur la préservation de la cohérence par image inverse extraordinaire par une immersion fermée", *ArXiv Mathematics e-prints* (2012).

[Car12b] — , "Systèmes inductifs surcohérents de $\mathcal{D}$-modules arithmétiques", *ArXiv Mathematics e-prints* (2012).

[CT12] D. CARO et N. TSUZUKI – "Overholonomicity of overconvergent F-isocrystals over smooth varieties", *Ann. of Math. (2)* **176** (2012), no. 2, p. 747–813.

[dJ96] A. J. DE JONG – "Smoothness, semi-stability and alterations", *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.* (1996), no. 83, p. 51–93.

[Ked07] K. S. KEDLAYA – "Semistable reduction for overconvergent F-isocrystals. I. Unipotence and logarithmic extensions", *Compos. Math.* **143** (2007), no. 5, p. 1164–1212.

[Ked08] — , "Semistable reduction for overconvergent F-isocrystals. II. A valuation-theoretic approach", *Compos. Math.* **144** (2008), no. 3, p. 657–672.

[Ked09] — , "Semistable reduction for overconvergent F-isocrystals. III: Local semistable reduction at monomial valuations.", *Compos. Math.* **145** (2009), no. 1, p. 143–172.

[Ked11] — , "Semistable reduction for overconvergent F-isocrystals, IV: local semistable reduction at nonmonomial valuations", *Compos. Math.* **147** (2011), no. 2, p. 467–523.

[Shi10] A. SHIHO – "On logarithmic extension of overconvergent isocrystals", *Math. Ann.* **348** (2010), no. 2, p. 467–512.

[Vir04] A. VIRRION – "Trace et dualité relative pour les $\mathcal{D}$-modules arithmétiques", Geometric aspects of Dwork theory. Vol. I, II, Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin, 2004, p. 1039–1112.

Daniel Caro
Laboratoire de Mathématiques Nicolas Oresme
Université de Caen Campus 2
14032 Caen Cedex
France.
email: daniel.caro@unicaen.fr